SINGLE BENCH

CF 100L

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (C) NO. 7583 / 2006

PETITIONER

Sachin ku. Pradhan
S/o Sushil Chandra Pradhan
Aged about 23 years, Caste- Kolta,
R/o- Village Girna, P.O- Sukhipali
P.S- Pithora, Tehsil- Mahasamund
Dist- Mahasamund (C.G)

P.R. No. 7180/06
Presented by: H's Ahuja Adv.
dated 8/12/06

Versus

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through Secretary, Panchayat,
D.K.S Bhawan, Raipur
Dist- Raipur (C.G)

2. Chief Executive Officer,
Janpad Panchayat Pitthora,
Dist- Mahasamund (C.G)

3. Gram Panchayat- Girna
Through Sarpanch
P.O.-Sukhipali, Vikaskhand Pithora
Tehsil- Mahasamund,
Dist- Mahasamund (C.G)

4. Rankmani Pradhan
S/o- Shoukilal Pradhan
Aged about 25 years, Caste- Kolta,
R/o-Village Girna, P.O- Sukhipali
P.S Pithora Tehsil-Mahasamund
Dist Mahasamund (C.G)

OATH COMMISSIONER
APARNA MALVIYA
CG 2073/96
06/12/06
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

CERTIFIED COPY
8/12/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

2 (5)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A SUITABLE WRIT ORDER OF DIRECTION TO DO JUSTICE IN THE MATTER.

(37)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (C) No. 7583 of 2006

Petitioner — Sachin Kumar Pradhan

Versus

Respondents — State of Chhattisgarh & others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Present: Shri H.S. Ahluwalia, Advocate for the petitioner.
Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the respondent No. 1.

O R D E R

(Passed on 23rd Day of January, 2007)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition impugning the order dated 12-12-2005 (Annexure P-1), wherein one Mr. Rankmani Pradhan/respondent No. 4 was appointed. There is statutory provisions under rule 3 of the Madhya Pradesh Panchayats (Appeal and Revision) Rules, 1995, whereby an appeal against the order passed by Gram Panchayat is maintainable before the Sub-Divisional Officer.

2. The petitioner, without availing remedy of statutory appeal, has approached to this Court directly. It is well settled principle of law that in case the statutory appeal/alternative remedy is available, this Court should be loath to entertain the petition.

3. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed as not maintainable. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash